UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/506,767	02/18/2000	Craig A. Link	MFCP.68211	8104

7590 03/06/2003

John Weresh
Shook Hardy & Bacon LLP
One Kansas City Place
1200 Main Street
Kansas City, MO 64105-2118

EXAMINER
CHARLES, DEBRA F

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
3628	

DATE MAILED: 03/06/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/506,767	Applicant(s) LINK ET AL.
	Examiner Debra F. Charles	Art Unit 3628

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *19 December 2002* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-31* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-31* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other:

Claims 1-31 have been reviewed.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Claims 16 and 23 have been amended. Claims 30 and 31 have been added.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-31 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1, 2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,11, 16, 17,19, and 23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller (US 5117351A), Munroe et al. (US 581765A) and Schlater et al. (US 6148420A).

Re claims: 1,11, 16, 17 and 23. Miller disclose a method of producing a unique modified account name based on a requested account name that has been determined to already exist(Miller, Abstract, col. 1, lines 32-45), the method comprising the steps of:

combining the word element and the requested account name to produce a modified account name(Miller, Abstract, col. 1, lines 60-67, i.e. "concatenating the identifier of the nodes associated with the objects");

comparing the modified account name with existing account names to determine whether the modified account name is unique(Miller, Abstract, col. 2, lines 40-55, col. 4, lines 60-66); and

if the modified account name is unique(Miller, Abstract, col. 5, lines 49-63, i.e. "ensures that current identifier will not contain the same random name-sequence as the previous identifier").

Re claim 5: Miller disclose further comprising the step of producing a modified account name based on the requested account name that has been determined to already exist(Miller, Abstract, col. 5, lines 49-67, i.e. "even if subsequent identifier has the same time component as a previously generated identifier").

As applied to all claims above: Miller does not explicitly disclose(s) that selecting a word element from a list of word elements. However, in col. 7, lines 22-42 thereof, Munroe et al. disclose(s) that the address generator chooses A.sub.1 in step 92 by using a role that allocates A.sub.1 values for objects restored from other systems, such as selecting from a list of available high-order addresses. Thus, A.sub.1 in the first address space is selected from the top of the available address list, although the value A.sub.0 (step 88) was selected from the bottom of the available address list in the base space. Thus, it would have been within the level of ordinary skill in the art to select data items from lists and combine them to ensure unique identifiers.

Miller does not explicitly disclose providing the modified account name to the user for acceptance. However, in col. 3, lines 45-60, col. 5, lines 38-59 thereof, Schlater et al. disclose(s) that the invention allows the user to select the name of the column shown in the display. Thus, it would have been within the level of ordinary skill in the art to permit the user to select names presented via the application interface to ensure the user-selected name fits the user's preferences.

As applied to claim 5 above: Miller does not explicitly disclose a second modified account name. However, Miller does indicate in col. 1, lines 30-50, i.e. "every time an identifier is required, a request for one is sent over the network". Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ multiple modified account names to get the benefit of more than one unique account name generated by the identifier generating system.

Miller does not explicitly disclose the combination of a word element and a requested account name. However, Miller discloses a random name sequence components. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ random name sequence components as a word element and as a requested account name to get the benefit of randomly generated unique names that are effectively word elements and are effectively account names. The random name sequence components create a unique name for an object and its associated data paralleling the function of an account name.

Re claim 2: Miller does not explicitly disclose(s) that the word element is randomly selected from the list of word elements. However, in col. 7, lines 22-42 thereof, Munroe et al. disclose(s) that the address generator chooses A.sub.1 in step 92 by using a role that allocates A.sub.1 values for objects restored from other systems, such as selecting from a list of available high-order addresses. Thus, A.sub.1 in the first address space is selected from the top of the available address list, although the value A.sub.0 (step 88) was selected from the bottom of the available address list in the base space. Thus, it would have been within the level of ordinary skill in the art to select data items from lists and combine them to ensure unique identifiers.

Re claims 3,4, and 19: Miller does not explicitly disclose(s) that the word element is an adjective, an affix or a noun. However, in abstract i.e. "A listing tool receives the parallel words and generates a listing to be displayed" col. 5, lines 37-59, i.e. "allows the user to select the name of the column shown in the display which is to represent the column of parallel words" thereof, Schlater et al. disclose(s) that the parallel words. Thus, it would have been within the level of ordinary skill in the art to select words from a list to ensure unique account names, given that the words are interchangeable and the type of word selected would not affect the functionality of the invention since it would not matter if the word were an adjective, noun or affix.

Re claim 6: Miller discloses further comprising the step of producing a unique seeded account name based on the requested account name(Miller, Abstract, col. 4, lines 30-43, i.e. "with reference to Figs. 3 and 4, a UID-generator includes a node-id register and a version-number register, each appropriately initialized").

Re claim 7: Miller discloses a method as recited in claim 6, wherein the seed is a single digit number, the method further comprises the steps of incrementing the numerical seed by one if the first seeded account name is not unique(Miller, Abstract, col. 4, lines 30-43, col. 5, lines 55-62, i.e. "in the preferred embodiment the name-sequence is changed by incrementing it.").

Re claim 8: Miller discloses a method as recited in claim 6, wherein the numerical seed is a multi-digit number that is randomly generated(Miller, col. 2, lines 33-39, i.e. "the current time" and "a (software/hardware) version number", col. 4, lines 30-43).

Re claim 9: Miller disclose comprising the steps of generating a second multi-digit numerical seed if the first seeded account name is not unique col. 2, lines 33-57, i.e. "the current time" and "a (software/hardware) version number", col. 4, lines 30-43, combining the requested account name with the second numerical seed to produce a second seeded account name col. 1, lines 60-67, i.e. "concatenating the identifier of the nodes associated with the objects").

8. Claims 10,12,13,14,15, 18,20,21,22,24,25,26,27,28 and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Miller, Munroe et al. and Schlater et al. as applied to claims 1, 5,6 and 17 above, and further in view of Swift et al. (US 5768519A).

Re claims 10, 15 and 22: Miller disclose the numerical seed to produce a second seeded account name if the first seeded account name is not unique (Miller, Abstract, col. 4, lines 30-43, i.e. "with reference to Figs. 3 and 4, a UID-generator includes a node-id register and a version-number register, each appropriately initialized").

Miller does not explicitly disclose the steps of combining the requested account name with an underscore. However, in col. 15, lines 55-67 thereof, Swift et al. disclose(s) that the account name is changed from "AL" to "AL_1". Thus, it would have been within the level of ordinary skill in the art to include an underscore character to concatenating the seeded randomly generated name to ensure unique account names.

Re claim 18: Miller discloses the first and second word elements are randomly selected(Miller, Abstract, col. 2, lines 25-40)

Re claim 21. Miller discloses wherein if the unique random account name is produced in fewer than the predetermined number of iterations(Miller, col. 5, lines 15-25), the method further includes the steps of selecting further word elements(Miller, col. 2, lines 25-40).

As applied to claims 18 and 21: Miller does not explicitly disclose the database. However, in col. 5, lines 30-67, i.e. thereof, Swift et al. disclose(s) that the database stores known account information. Thus, it would have been within the level of ordinary skill in the art to pull a randomly selected group of words from a database to ensure the computer system pulls up words that are within a certain range.

Re claims 12, 13,14 and 20: Miller discloses wherein if the modified account name is not unique, the steps for producing the unique modified account name are repeated for up to a predetermined number of iterations until a unique modified account name is produced(Miller, col. 5, lines 15-25).

Re claim 24: Miller disclose a computer-readable medium having computer-executable components for producing a unique modified account name based on a requested account name that has been determined to already exist(Miller, Abstract, col. 1, lines 32-45), comprising:

a user interface component for receiving an account name request(Miller, col. 1, lines 10-25, i.e. "terminals");

a name generating component for selecting word elements and combining the word elements with the requested account name to produce modified account names(Miller, Abstract, col. 2, lines 25-67, col. 3, lines 35-55); and

a search component for comparing the modified account names with a list of existing account names to determine whether the modified account names are unique(Miller, Abstract, col. 2, lines 40-55, col. 4, lines 60-66) and, if the modified account names are unique(Miller, Abstract, col. 5, lines 49-63, i.e. "ensures that current identifier will not contain the same random name-sequence as the previous identifier").

Re claims 25 and 26: Miller does not explicitly disclose(s) that the word element is an adjective, or an affix. However, in abstract i.e. "A listing tool receives the parallel words and generates a listing to be displayed" col. 5, lines 37-59, i.e. "allows the user to select the name of the column shown in the display which is to represent the column of parallel words" thereof, Schlater et al. disclose(s) that the parallel words. Thus, it would have been within the level of ordinary skill in the art to select words from a list to ensure unique account names, given that the words are interchangeable and the type of word selected would not affect the functionality of the invention since it would not matter if the word were an adjective, noun or affix.

Re claim 28: Miller discloses a computer-readable medium wherein the name generating component further produces a seeded account name based on the requested account name(Miller, Fig. 4, items 30,31, and 32, Abstract, i.e. "unique time component" and "a (software/Hardware) version number"):

the seeded account name being produced by combining the requested account name with a numerical seed(Miller, Fig. 4, items 30,31, and 32, Abstract, i.e. "unique time component" and "a (software/Hardware) version number"),

the search component comparing the seeded account name with the list of existing account names to determine whether the seeded account name is unique(Miller, Abstract, i.e. "the generator compares the then current time with the stored time component").

Miller does not explicitly disclose the database. However, in col. 5, lines 30-67, i.e. thereof, Swift et al. disclose(s) that the database stores known account information. Thus, it would have been within the level of ordinary skill in the art to pull a randomly selected group of words from a database to ensure the computer system pulls up words that are within a certain range.

Miller does not explicitly disclose(s) that selecting a word element from a list of word elements. However, in col. 7, lines 22-42 thereof, Munroe et al. disclose(s) that the address generator chooses A.sub.1 in step 92 by using a role that allocates A.sub.1 values for objects restored from other systems, such as selecting from a list of available high-order addresses. Thus, A.sub.1 in the first address space is selected from the top of the available address list, although the value A.sub.0 (step 88) was selected from the bottom of the available address list in the base space. Thus, it would have been within the level of ordinary skill in the art to select data items from lists and combine them to ensure unique identifiers.

As applied to claims 24 and 28 above: Miller does not explicitly disclose providing the modified account name to the user for acceptance. However, in col. 5, lines 38-59 thereof, Schlater et al. disclose(s) that the invention allows the user to select the name of the column shown in the display. Thus, it would have been within the level of ordinary skill in the art to permit the user to select names presented via the application interface to ensure the user-selected name fits the user's preferences.

Re claim 27: Miller discloses a computer-readable medium wherein the name generating component randomly selects the word elements(Miller, Abstract, col. 1, lines 32-45, col. 2, lines 30-40).

Miller does not explicitly disclose(s) a list of word elements. However, in col. 7, lines 22-42 thereof, Munroe et al. disclose(s) that the address generator chooses A.sub.1 in step 92 by using a role that allocates A.sub.1 values for objects restored from other systems,

such as selecting from a list of available high-order addresses. Thus, A.sub.1 in the first address space is selected from the top of the available address list, although the value A.sub.0 (step 88) was selected from the bottom of the available address list in the base space. Thus, it would have been within the level of ordinary skill in the art to select data items from lists and combine them to ensure unique identifiers.

Re claim 29: Miller disclose a name generating component further produces a random account name by selecting two further word elements(Miller, Abstract, col. 1, lines 32-45), and combining them (Miller, Abstract, col. 1, lines 60-67, i.e. "concatenating the identifier of the nodes associated with the objects"),

the search component comparing the random account name is unique, and if the

random account name is unique, providing the random account name to the user for

acceptance (Miller, Abstract, col. 2, lines 40-55, col. 4, lines 60-66, col. 5, lines 49-63,

i.e. "ensures that current identifier will not contain the same random name-sequence as

the previous identifier").

Miller does not explicitly disclose providing the modified account name to the user for acceptance. However, in col. 3, lines 45-60, col. 5, lines 38-59 thereof, Schlater et al. disclose(s) that the invention allows the user to select the name of the column shown in the display. Thus, it would have been within the level of ordinary skill in the art to permit the user to select names presented via the application interface to ensure the user-selected name fits the user's preferences.

8. Claims 30 and 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable

over Miller and Munroe et al.

Re claim 30: Miller discloses a method of producing a unique account name based on a requested account name comprising:

receiving a request from a user for an account name(Miller, col. 1, lines 30-40);

utilizing multiple solution sets t of unique account names(Miller, Abstract, col. 2, lines 25-67, i.e. "identifier", "current time", "random-name sequence", and "a (software/hardware) version number), wherein there is a limit to the number of iterations for which each one of the multiple solution sets is utilized(Miller, col. 5, lines 15-25), and

a first solution set to provide at least one unique account name based on the requested account name, by combining the requested account name with a numerical seed(Miller, col. 1, lines 30-67, col. 6, lines 40-55);

a second solution set to provide at least one unique account name based on the requested account name, by combining the requested account name with a multi-digit seed(Miller, col. 1, lines 60-67, col. 2, lines 30-40, i.e. "identifier node", "current time" and "a (software/hardware) version", col. 6, lines 40-55) if one or more previously utilized solution sets did not provide said fixed number of unique account names within the iteration limit(Miller, col. 5, lines 15-25);

a third solution set to provide at least one unique account name based on the requested account name, by pre-pending the requested account name with an adjective(Miller, col. 1, lines 60-67), if one or more previously utilized solution sets did not provide said fixed number of unique account names within the iteration limit(Miller, col. 5, lines 15-25); and

a fourth solution set to provide at least one unique account name, by combining two word elements(Miller, Abstract, col. 1, lines 60-67, i.e. "concatenating the identifier of the nodes associated with the objects"), if one or more previously utilized solution sets did not provide said fixed number of unique account names within the iteration limit(Miller, col. 5, lines 15-25).

Miller does not explicitly disclose(s) to produce a listing, a list of account names must contain a fixed number of unique account names, presenting the user with said listing of unique names and allowing the user to select one of said listings as an account name, a list of words and two lists of words. However, in col. 7, lines 22-42 thereof, Munroe et al. disclose(s) that the address generator chooses A.sub.1 in step 92 by using a role that allocates A.sub.1 values for objects restored from other systems, such as selecting from a list of available high-order addresses. Thus, A.sub.1 in the first address space is selected from the top of the available address list, although the value A.sub.0 (step 88) was selected from the bottom of the available address list in the base space. Thus, it would have been within the level of ordinary skill in the art to select data items from lists and combine them to ensure unique identifiers.

Miller does not explicitly disclose when said limit is reached a different solution set is utilized. However, Miller does indicate the name-sequence adjuster then changes the random name-sequence in a predetermined manner. Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to employ a different solution set to get the benefit of generating unique names when the initial solution set is exhausted.

Re claim 31: Miller discloses a method of producing a unique random account name in response to a request by a user(Miller, Abstract, col. 1, lines 30-47, col. 4, lines 49-67), the method comprising the steps of;

enter a new string for use as an account name or request an automated generation of a new list of multiple alternate unique account names(Miller, Abstract, col. 1, lines 30-47, col. 4, lines 49-67, col. 6, lines 40-67).

Miller does not explicitly disclose(s) providing the user with the ability to select any one of said alternate unique account names, and selecting a list of multiple alternate unique account names. However, in col. 7, lines 22-42 thereof, Munroe et al. disclose(s) that the address generator chooses A.sub.1 in step 92 by using a role that allocates A.sub.1 values for objects restored from other systems, such as selecting from a list of available high-order addresses. Thus, A.sub.1 in the first address space is selected from the top of the available address list, although the value A.sub.0 (step 88) was selected from the bottom of the available address list in the base space. Thus, it would have been within the level of ordinary skill in the art to select data items from lists and combine them to ensure unique identifiers.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Debra F. Charles whose telephone number is (703) 305-4718. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5 Monday thru Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hyung Sough can be reached on (703) 308-0505. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 305-7687 for regular communications and (703) 305-7687 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1113.

Debra F. Charles
Examiner
Art Unit 3628

dfc
February 27, 2003

Hyung-Sub Sough
Primary Examiner